

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #965
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Sun, 3 Dec 89 Volume 89 : Issue 965

Today's Topics:

(#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
 airport security & nintendo
 Contests
 ICOM 25A pll debug
 Icom Newsletter (2 msgs)
 illegal to try radio before buying?
 My backyard, your backyard ...
 Privacy etc etc

Date: 3 Dec 89 16:18:17 GMT
From: sun-barr!newstop!texsun!texbell!attctc!sampson@apple.com (Steve Sampson)
Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
Message-ID: <10464@attctc.Dallas.TX.US>

In article <8969.2577E86E@stjhmc.fidonet.org>, Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org
(Jim Grubs) writes:

>
> I guess you weren't around when the FCC told us we couldn't even use ham radio
> for things like a guy mobiling home from work asking his wife by phone patch
> (or directly if she had a ticket) if she wanted him to pick up a loaf of bread
> at the supermarket on the way.
>

What was the date, number, and actual content of the citation? I want to see
the facts in this! Did this happen to you, or is this hear-say? I want a
reference! Personally I would appeal the descision all the way up. This is
not correct, and doesn't make sense. I think your pulling our leg.

Date: 3 Dec 89 16:56:18 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!ut-emx!walt.cc.utexas.edu!rdd@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Robert
Dorsett)
Subject: airport security & nintendo
Message-ID: <21794@ut-emx.UUCP>

In article <8912020811.AA27723@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU> peraino@GMUVAX.GMU.EDU writes:
>> took a nintendo...and blew it up

> I'm not sure who the stupid one is here. What's wrong with a policy that

>says "check out luggage that really looks like it contains a bomb."
>I guess if you had your way, the policy would be " Check out luggage
>that definitely has a bomb." And how are we supposed to do that?

[...]

> People like you don't say anything when security doesn't check closely
>enough and a bomb gets through, but you bitch about security that
>says, "better safe than sorry." I can honestly say that if it were my bag
>that blew up, and they told me that I would be reimbursed, I would
>not be upset at all. They were doing their jobs. There's no rule which
>says a bomb has to exist before taking precautions to check for the
>existence of a bomb. You know nothing about security.

Such a policy is idiotic. The Israelis (and other security-conscious carriers) have much more enlightened policies: for instance, TWO hand-searches of baggage before getting on the carrier. Positive identification of all pieces. Then having everyone identify baggage before boarding (anything left is treated as a bomb). If a piece has been identified as suspicious, the owner can be asked to demonstrate that it isn't.

On the other hand, to simply see something "suspicious," run out into the middle of a field, and blow it up is, well... dumb. It also ignores the possibility that another weapon exists aboard the aircraft. In addition, why a NINTENDO set? Doesn't a can of shaving cream look like a bomb? How about a tube of toothpaste? Plastic explosive can look like anything (a ski boot, for instance); the detonator need not look suspicious at all. No, this entire episode strikes me as extreme overreaction. Moreover, I understand that this was engineered in the US, at LAX. Could the legendary incompetent security people the airlines like to hire have possibly fucked up?

Robert Dorsett
Internet: rdd@rascal.ics.utexas.edu
UUCP: ...cs.utexas.edu!rascal.ics.utexas.edu!rdd

Date: 3 Dec 89 15:01:26 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: Contests
Message-ID: <5641@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <89336.025048AFZ1@PSUVM.BITNET> AFZ1@PSUVM.BITNET writes:
>SUPPOSE IF ONE IS NOT INTENDING TO ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN THE CONTEST,

>CAN ONE JUST GIVE THE SAME SERIAL NUMBER LIKE 001 SAY (IF SERIAL NUMBERS
>ARE REQUESTED)? I SOMETIMES CALL THE CONTESTING STATIONS AND DO NOT KEEP
>TRACK OF HOW MANY STATIONS I WORKED, SO I SOMETIMES JUST GIVE 001 FOR ANY
>STATIONS I CALLED. WOULD THE STATIONS BE PENALIZED WHEN ALL THEIR LOGS
>INDICATE A 59 001 FROM THE SAME CALLSIGN?

They might. It depends on whose log is selected for the cross referencing, and if they have also worked you. Typically what happens, is that between 1 and 10 big guns have their logs selected. These logs are compared to each other, and everybody else's log is compared to all of these. I do not know how much checking is actually performed. However, it can't be too much, since logs are still sent in as handwritten copy, and must be checked by a human. It is a formidable task, even for a computer.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh

Date: 3 Dec 89 21:49:46 GMT
From: mfci!rodman@uunet.uu.net (Paul Rodman)
Subject: ICOM 25A pll debug
Message-ID: <1148@m3.mfci.UUCP>

Hello netters,
I need some technical advice...

My father, KA1YZ has an IC25A mobile rig that he is trying to fix. The problem seems to be in the PLL area. He has no scope, but has a DMM and grid dipper and a 2at handheld. The symptoms are:

The radio does not function when first turned on, the lights etc. work (i.e. cpu is ok) but RF is neither received nor xmitted.

After about 15-20 minutes the radio will start to work. Turning the radio off, then on, will still have the radio working. Turning the radio off for 20min or so and you will have to wait 20min again.

The problem is not mechanically sensitive, and surprisingly, does not seem to be thermal either (dispite the above). Hitting the board with a heat gun does NOT make it come up quicker, freezing the board doesn't cause it to stop working when it is.

The voltage on the VCO input (output pin 16 on the pll chip) is about 0 volts on a DMM when not working and about 2.5 volts (varing with

freq as it should) when working). The output of the PLL buffer amp shows good signal on his dip meter at ~120Mhz (this is correct) when it is working, nothing when dead.

Here are my specific questions:

1) Should the VCO be free-running at some wild freq even if the PLL chip is not working? The VCO seems to be not oscillating at all when radio is not working. Seems to indicate problem is in the VCO. Perhaps Q5 is dead?

2) The PLL chip has an output called "LD" (pin 18) which is said to be a lock detect output from the chip. This pin measures about 6.3 volts whether the radio is working or not. Unfortunately the book doesn't say if it is active high or low for lock detect, but I assume it is a dc level and will not change value very rapidly and can be looked at with a meter, and not a scope. Why is this not changing? Perhaps the PLL chip is dead?

3) Is it possible that the radio behaves the way it does (slow startup) because of some cap or other device that needs to "heal"? Any suggestions on what kind of process would account for this behavior?

73's and thanks in advance for any ideas you may have, send them directly to me if possible. I assumed that the problem would be a simple "bad connection" or thermal bad-component but doesn't seem to be the case. Due to the feedback in the ckt it is proving non-trivial to track down the source of the problem.....

Paul K. Rodman / KA1ZA / rodman@multiflow.com
Multiflow Computer, Inc. Tel. 203 488 6090 x 236
Branford, Ct. 06405

Date: 3 Dec 89 15:26:44 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: Icom Newsletter
Message-ID: <5643@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <12600086@silver> commgrp@silver.bacs.indiana.edu writes:
>>>... the Nov/Dec 1989 _Icom Newsletter_ from International Radio and
>>>Computers, Inc. [751 S. Macedo Blvd., Port St. Lucie, FL 34983
>>>(407)878-8856] describes mods for IC-2400 which expand UHF
>>>coverage 400-479 MHz and VHF 138-174 MHz. There is also a 300 MHz
>>>mod, and a crossband repeater mod. Does anyone know if the IC-2400

>>>in repeater mode will do offsets??
>>Is the Icom Newsletter any good?...
>Frankly, not very. But it has no competition; it's the best source of
>collected mods I know (they also publish Yaesu and Kenwood
>newsletters). Their published instructions for mods are often
>abbreviated and ambiguous (but all I have tried have worked). They
>claim copyright on info taken verbatim from this newsgroup (I know
>because I discovered some of my own writing in the Icom Newsletter).
>Frank W9MKV reid@gold.bacs.indiana.edu

Do they charge for subscriptions? If they do, this would really piss me off. I have posted mods here, and I am about to post another one in the next couple of days. If somebody is taking this information that I have written, claiming a copyright on it, and SELLING it, they are obviously doing something immoral and possibly illegal. I am tempted to subscribe before I post my next mod, and then prosecute them to the maximum extent possible if they do this with something that I have posted into the public domain.

Corollary: These guys that go to hamfests, and charge \$50+ to modify radios, really bother me. They refuse to tell you exactly what the modification is, because this would of course hurt their "business." If somebody wants to pay them to work on their radio, that's acceptable to me. If people pay them because the information is not available to them about how to do it themselves, this really bothers me. Capitalizing on peoples ignorance is immoral. Keeping people ignorant by not revealing public information, just so you can take their money, is worse. (Note: This does not apply to businesses keeping trade secrets that they developed themselves. The key here is that the information is not public, and is still the intellectual property of the owner.)

In the rare case that original ideas	Kenneth J. Hendrickson	N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible.	Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825	
Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu	UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh	

Date: 3 Dec 89 23:12:12 GMT
From: chuq@apple.com (Chuq Von Rospach)
Subject: Icom Newsletter
Message-ID: <36973@apple.Apple.COM>

>If somebody is taking this information that I have
>written, claiming a copyright on it, and SELLING it, they are obviously
>doing something immoral and possibly illegal. I am tempted to
>subscribe before I post my next mod, and then prosecute them to the
>maximum extent possible if they do this with something that I have
>posted into the public domain.

Not necessarily. Especially with the term 'public domain' -- which implies that there are *no* rights to the work at all. If something is in the public domain, it is free and clear, meaning they have the same moral, ethical and legal rights as the author, since the author, by putting it in the public domain, has relinquished rights to it.

An argument could be made under current copyright law that there's an implicit copyright on the material; for postings on the net, I personally doubt that'd stick up in court. Unless you explicitly copyright a posting, you should assume it's public domain, and once it's public domain, someone can do *anything* they want with it. If you care about it, copyright it.

>Corollary: These guys that go to hamfests, and charge \$50+ to modify
>radios, really bother me. They refuse to tell you exactly what the
>modification is, because this would of course hurt their "business."

It *is* their business. If you don't like it, there's no reason why you can't come up with your own patch. They're under no obligation to give away the results of their work -- and you're under no obligation to buy it. They're not keeping you from figuring out the fixes for yourself, after all.

--

Chuq Von Rospach <+> chuq@apple.com <+> [This is myself speaking]

When it comes to matters outside your specialties, you are consistently and brilliantly stupid [....] with respect to matters you haven't studied and have had no experience basing your opinions on casual gossip [....] and plain misinformation -- unsuspected because you haven't attempted to verify it.

-- Robert Heinlein to J.W. Campbell, Jr. 1941

Date: 3 Dec 89 15:49:06 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: illegal to try radio before buying?
Message-ID: <5645@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <294@ssc.UUCP> tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook) writes:

%In closing, I am going to ask Mr. Grubs to test his theory about trying
%a radio before buying is a federal crime.

%

%On Saturday, December 9, 1989 I am going to walk into Amateur Radio
%Supply Co, 6313 13th Ave S, Seattle, WA and TRY A RADIO BEFORE BUYING
%IT! For your convenience, I will call CQ with my call, KT7H, and
%use an antenna that is on the roof of the store, and will transmit on
%14.300 MHz SSB. This will take place sometime before 2100 UTC.

%

%PLEASE, PLEASE, MR. GRUBS, QUIT MISINFORMING THE NEWCOMERS TO THE HOBBY
%AND PLEASE *HAVE ME ARRESTED* !

%

%The phone number of the local Seattle FCC office is 206-764-3324.
%The number for the local FCC monitoring station is 206-354-4892.
%If for some reason (?) the FCC is not interested in pursuing the
%perpetrator of this dastardly felony, you may be able to stir up
%some interest by calling the local Amateur FCC Auxillary at
%206-226-4222. Ask for Millard Gibson, W7JIE.

%

%73!

%

%Tad Cook

%tad@ssc.UUCP

%KT7H @ N7HFZ.WA.USA.NA

Tad: I will also incur whatever expense it takes, to come to Seattle (or
wherever else they lock you up) and visit you in prison as a show of
solidarity.

Giga :-D

Grubs: Have you ever considered that laws are written because we
recognize something is immoral. It's not the other way around: things
don't become immoral because we pass a law against them. Trying out a
radio before you buy it is such a heinous crime against humanity that
violators should be punished quite severely!

Terra :-D

In the rare case that original ideas	Kenneth J. Hendrickson	N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible.	Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI	48825
Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu	UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh	

Date: 3 Dec 89 07:38:20 GMT

From: oliveb!stratus!cloud9!jjmhome!cpoint!die@apple.com (David I. Emery)

Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...

Message-ID: <3008@cpoint.UUCP>

In article <6589@lynx.UUCP> neal@lynx.UUCP (Neal Woodall) writes:

>My point was that it is illegal to receive the services without *paying*
>for them. The point I was trying to make is that you have a right to
>receive anything, but that a victimization occurs if you receive a service
>that is intended as a revenue-generating product or service and you do not
>pay the fair market value for the service.

>
>Your "right to receive" does NOT end just because someone intends that
>certain programming be paid for by the receiver. You still have the
>"right to receive".....the program provider cannot stop you from receiving
>the signal, but you should pay for the service, just like the intended
>audience.
>
>You have an absolute right, IMHO, to receive ANYTHING that is broadcast
>over the public's radio spectrum, but this does not mean that you can
>get away with not paying for certain services!

If I understand Neal correctly, he is asserting I have an absolute right to receive, demodulate and display the intelligence contained in any radio signal that I can pick up, but I have no unconstrained rights of any kind whatsoever to make any use of the information contained therein.

Specifically, he asserts that the owner of the information has the right to collect revenues from me for its use by me, and I no right to use it without paying the customary charges for such use to such owner.

Neal fails to answer a couple of obvious questions that occur to me - suppose the owner of the information doesn't want me to use it at all, is he entitled to refuse to sell it to me at all or to charge outrageous prices (sort of what HBO currently does to private dish owners) ? Is there some doctrine in Neal's vision of "moral law" that requires the information be sold a "fair price" ?

And why, if the right to use information intercepted from a radio source is limited by the requirement to pay for it, is it not perfectly consistant for people who want their communications to be private to claim that they are running a real live soap opera for profit, and that the right to listen to their communications (and thus use their information) requires a payment of \$1,000,000 per minute in advance ?

Neal might argue that this exaggerated price is not a fair price, but it is quite clear to me that in a true economic sense the right to listen to someone elses communications is in fact something that has a demonstrable economic value to those who practice this hobby. I would assert that the right to *not* be listened to also has an economic value which for some people under some circumstances is probably quite considerable. And why should I not price the right to listen to my cell phone conversations at a high enough figure to compensate me for the indignity of having someone silently slobbering over my every word when I call my mistress ? (I might hasten to add that in real life I currently have neither a cell phone or a mistress, but that is another story).

In short I would like Neal to explain what exact rights to information

transmitted by radio are forfeited by the user of a radio system and what are not ? It seems extremely odd to me that only the right to receive payment for the use of pay-for-use information is preserved; and I do not understand how he derives this odd conclusion.

Perhaps the only rational view is that Neal sees someone using pay-for-use information received from radio as committing some kind of fraud or theft of service entirely apart from the interception, so that if they were able to receive HBO by mental telepathy without paying for it they would still be committing the same crime.

Date: 3 Dec 89 15:11:24 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: Privacy etc etc
Message-ID: <5642@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <89120107514766@masnet.uucp> jim.shutsa@canremote.uucp (JIM SHUTSA) writes:

> The public airwaves are the PUBLIC airwaves. Phone lines are are
>private hard-wired systems. Cellular phones use the PUBLIC airwaves.
>Public airwaves can, and do, trespass over my personal jurisdiction ie:my
>house, property etc. As far as I'm concerned, anything on PUBLIC
>airwaves is fair game for interception. If privacy is of the utmost
>concern, don't go PUBLIC.

I agree. Here is sanity. Here is reason. Here is practicality. Here is common sense. The military understands this. The government understands this. Big business understands this. Some amateur radio operators understand this. Polititians probably never will.

Corollary: Many phone companies route long distance calls by microwave. You've all seen those 100'-200' towers with many parabolic antennas on them. If the phone company puts the RF into my back yard for these phone calls, and I receive it, there should not be any legal problem with this. If, however, I go and WIREtap somebodies phone, and physically connect my wires to the phone companies wires, then I have broken the law (a reasonable sane law that is enforcable I should add) and should be prosecuted. Obviously, I disagree with many polititians and lawyers, and possibly the US supreme court at times.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #965
